arXiv:1702.07093v1 [math.LO] 23 Feb 2017

VARIATIONS ON A VISSERIAN THEME

Ali Enayat

February 24, 2017

Abstract

A first order theory T is *tight* iff for any deductively closed extensions U and V of T (both of which are formulated in the language of T), U and V are bi-interpretable iff $U = V$. By a theorem of Visser, PA (Peano Arithmetic) is tight. Here we show that Z_2 (second order arithmetic), ZF (Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory), and KM (Kelley-Morse theory of classes) are also tight theories.

1 Introduction

The source of inspiration for this paper is located in a key result of Albert Visser [V, Corollaries 9.4 & 9.6] concerning a curious interpretability-theoretic feature of PA (Peano arithmetic), namely:

1.1. Theorem. (Visser) *Suppose U and V are deductively closed extensions of* PA (*both of which are formulated in the language of* PA). *Then U is a retract of V if $V \subseteq U$.* ***In particular,*** *U* ***and*** *V* ***are bi-interpretable iff*** *$U = V$.*

A natural reaction to Theorem 1.1 is to ask whether the exhibited interpretability-theoretic feature of PA is shared by other theories. As shown here, the answer to this question is positive[1], in particular:

1.2. Theorem[2]**.** *Theorem 1.1 remains valid if* PA *is replaced throughout by* Z_2 (*second order arithmetic*); *or by* ZF (*Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory*); *or by* KM (*Kelley-Morse theory of classes*).

[1] The ZF-case of Theorem 1.2 was established independently in unpublished work of Albert Visser and Harvey Friedman. I am thankful to Albert for bringing this to my attention.

[2] See Remark 2.8 for a more complete version of this theorem.

In the remainder of this section we review some basic notions and results of interpretability theory in order to clarify and contextualize Theorems 1.1 & 1.2.

1.3. Definitions. Suppose U and V are first order theories, and for the sake of notational simplicity, let us assume that U and V are theories that *support a definable pairing function* and *are formulated in relational languages*. We use $\mathcal{L}_U$ and $\mathcal{L}_V$ to respectively designate the languages of U and V.

(a) An interpretation $\mathcal{I}$ of U in V, written:

$$\mathcal{I} : U \to V$$

is given by a translation τ of each $\mathcal{L}_U$-formula φ into an $\mathcal{L}_V$-formula φ^τ with the requirement that $V \vdash \varphi^\tau$ for each $\varphi \in U$, where τ is determined by an $\mathcal{L}_V$-formula $\delta(x)$ (referred to as a *domain formula*), and a mapping $P \mapsto_\tau A_P$ that translates each n-ary $\mathcal{L}_U$-predicate P into some n-ary $\mathcal{L}_V$-formula A_P. The translation is then lifted to the full first order language in the obvious way by making it commute with propositional connectives, and subject to:

$$(\forall x \varphi)^\tau = \forall x(\delta(x) \to \varphi^\tau) \text{ and } (\exists x \varphi)^\tau = \exists x(\delta(x) \wedge \varphi^\tau).$$

Note that each interpretation $\mathcal{I} : U \to V$gives rise to an *inner model construction that* ***uniformly*** *builds a model* $\mathcal{M}^{\mathcal{I}} \models U$ *for any* $\mathcal{M} \models V$.

(b) U is *interpretable* in V, written $U \trianglelefteq V$, iff there is an interpretation $\mathcal{I} : U \to V$. U and V are *mutually interpretable* when $U \trianglelefteq V$ and $V \trianglelefteq U$.

(c) We indicate the universe of each structure with the corresponding Roman letter, e.g., the universes of structures $\mathcal{M}$, $\mathcal{N}$, and $\mathcal{M}^*$ are respectively M, N, and M^*. Given an $\mathcal{L}$-structure $\mathcal{M}$ and $X \subseteq M^n$ (where n is a positive integer), we say that X is $\mathcal{M}$-*definable* iff X is parametrically definable in $\mathcal{M}$, i.e., iff there is an n-ary formula $\varphi(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ in the language $\mathcal{L}_M$ obtained by augmenting $\mathcal{L}$ with constant symbols $\overline{m}$ for each $m \in M$ such that $X = \varphi^{\mathcal{M}}$, where $\varphi^{\mathcal{M}} = \{(a_1, \cdots, a_n) \in M^n : (\mathcal{M}, m)_{m \in M} \models \varphi(\overline{a}_1, \cdots, \overline{a}_n)\}$.

(d) Suppose $\mathcal{N}$ is an $\mathcal{L}_U$-structure and $\mathcal{M}$ is an $\mathcal{L}_V$-structure. We say that $\mathcal{N}$ is *parametrically interpretable* in $\mathcal{M}$, written $\mathcal{N} \trianglelefteq_{\text{par}} \mathcal{M}$ (equivalently: $\mathcal{M} \trianglerighteq_{\text{par}} \mathcal{N}$) iff the universe of discourse of $\mathcal{N}$, as well as all the $\mathcal{N}$-interpretations of $\mathcal{L}_U$-predicates are $\mathcal{M}$-definable. Note that $\trianglelefteq_{\text{par}}$ is a transitive relation.

(e) U is a *retract* of V iff there are interpretations $\mathcal{I}$ and $\mathcal{J}$ with $\mathcal{I} : U \to V$ and $\mathcal{J} : V \to U$, and a binary U-formula F such that F is, U-verifiably, an

isomorphism between id_U (the identity interpretation on U) and $\mathcal{J} \circ \mathcal{I}$. In model-theoretic terms, this translates to the requirement that the following holds for every $\mathcal{M} \models U$:

$$F^{\mathcal{M}} : \mathcal{M} \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{M}^* := \left(\mathcal{M}^{\mathcal{J}}\right)^{\mathcal{I}}.$$

(f) U and V are *bi-interpretable*[3] iff there are interpretations $\mathcal{I}$ and $\mathcal{J}$ as above that witness that U is a retract of V, and additionally, there is a V-formula G, such that G is, V-verifiably, an isomorphism between id_V and $\mathcal{I} \circ \mathcal{J}$. In particular, if U and V are bi-interpretable, then given $\mathcal{M} \models U$ and $\mathcal{N} \models V$, we have

$$F^{\mathcal{M}} : \mathcal{M} \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{M}^* := \left(\mathcal{M}^{\mathcal{J}}\right)^{\mathcal{I}} \text{ and } G^{\mathcal{N}} : \mathcal{N} \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{N}^* := \left(\mathcal{N}^{\mathcal{I}}\right)^{\mathcal{J}}.$$

We conclude this section with salient examples. In what follows ACA_0 (arithmetical comprehension with limited induction) and GB (Gödel-Bernays theory of classes) are the well-known subsystems of Z_2 and KM (respectively) satisfying: ACA_0 is a conservative extension of PA, and GB is a conservative extension of ZF.

1.4. Theorem. (Folklore) $\mathsf{PA} \trianglelefteq \mathsf{ACA}_0$ *and* $\mathsf{ZF} \trianglelefteq \mathsf{GB}$; *but* $\mathsf{ACA}_0 \not\trianglelefteq \mathsf{PA}$ *and* $\mathsf{GB} \not\trianglelefteq \mathsf{ZF}$.

Proof Outline. The first two statements have routine proofs; the last two follow by combining (a) the finite axiomatizability of ACA_0 and GB, (b) the reflexivity of PA and ZF (i.e., they prove the consistency of each finite fragment of themselves), and (c) Gödel's second incompleteness theorem. □

By classical results of Ackermann and Mycielski, the structures $(V_\omega, \in)$ and $(\mathbb{N}, +, \cdot)$ are bi-interpretable, where V_ω is the set of hereditarily finite sets. The two interpretations at work can be used to show Theorem 1.5 below. In what follows, $\mathsf{ZF}_{\mathsf{fin}}$ is the theory obtained by replacing the axiom of infinity

[3]The notion of bi-interpretability has been informally around for a long time, but according to Hodges [H] it was first studied in a general setting by Ahlbrandt and Ziegler [AZ]. A closely related concept (dubbed sometimes as *synonymy*, and other times as *definitional equivalence*) was introduced by de Bouvère [D]. Synonymy is a stronger form of bi-interpretation; however, by a result of Friedman and Visser [FV], in many cases synonymy is implied by bi-interpretability, namely, when the two theories involved are sequential, and the bi-interpretability between them is witnessed by a pair of one-dimensional, identity preserving interpretations.

by its negation in the usual axiomatization of ZF and TC is the sentence asserting "every set has a transitive closure".[4]

1.5. Theorem. (Ackermann [A], Mycielski [My], Kaye-Wong [KW]) PA *and* $\mathsf{ZF}_{\mathsf{fin}} + \mathsf{TC}$ *are bi-interpretable.*

1.6. Theorem. (E-Schmerl-Visser [ESV, Theorem 5.1]) $\mathsf{ZF}_{\mathsf{fin}}$ and PA *are not bi-interpretable; indeed* $\mathsf{ZF}_{\mathsf{fin}}$ *is not even a sentential retract*[5] *of* $\mathsf{ZF}_{\mathsf{fin}} + \mathsf{TC}$.

2 Solid Theories

The notions of solidity, neatness, and tightness encapsulated in Definition 2.1 below are only implicitly introduced in Visser's paper [V]. It is not hard to see that a solid theory is neat, and a neat theory is tight. Hence to establish Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 it suffices to verify the solidity of PA, Z_2, ZF, and KM. This is precisely what we will accomplish in this section. The proof of Theorem 1.1 is presented partly as an exposition of Visser's original proof which is rather indirect since it is couched in terms of series of technical general lemmata, and partly because it provides a warm-up for the proof of Theorem 2.5 which establishes the solidity of Z_2. The proof of Theorem 2.6 establishing the solidity of ZF, on the other hand, requires a brand new line of argument. The proof of Theorem 2.7, which establishes the solidity of KM is the most complex among the proofs presented here; it can be roughly described as using a blend of ideas from the proofs of Theorems 2.5 and 2.6.

2.1. Definition. Suppose T is a first order theory.
(a) T is *solid* iff the following property $(*)$ holds for all models $\mathcal{M}$, $\mathcal{M}^*$, and $\mathcal{N}$ of T:

$(*)$ If $\mathcal{M} \trianglerighteq_{\mathrm{par}} \mathcal{N} \trianglerighteq_{\mathrm{par}} \mathcal{M}^*$ and there is an $\mathcal{M}$-definable isomorphism $i_0 : \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{M}^*$, then there is an $\mathcal{M}$-definable isomorphism $i : \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{N}$.

[4] More explicitly; the axioms of $\mathsf{ZF}_{\mathsf{fin}}$ consists of the axioms of Extensionality, Empty Set, Pairs, Union, Power set, Foundation, and ¬Infinity, plus the scheme of Replacement. Note that $\mathsf{ZF}_{\mathsf{fin}}$ has also been used in the literature (e.g., by the Prague school) to denote the stronger theory in which the Foundation axiom is strengthened to the Foundation *scheme*; the latter theory is deductively identical to $\mathsf{ZF}_{\mathsf{fin}} + \mathsf{TC}$ in our notation.

[5] The notion of a sentential retract is the natural weakening of the notion of a retract in which the requirement of the existence of a definable isomorphism between $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{M}^*$ is weakened to the requirement that $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{M}^*$ be elementarily equivalent.

(b) T is *neat* iff for any two deductively closed extensions U and V of T (both of which are formulated in the language of T), U is a retract of V if $V \subseteq U$.
(c) T is *tight* iff for any two deductively closed extensions U and V of T (both of which are formulated in the language of T), U and V are bi-interpretable iff $U = V$.

2.1.1. Remark. A routine argument shows that if T and T' are bi-interpretable, and T is solid, then T' is also solid.

2.2. Theorem. (Visser [V]) PA *is solid.*

Proof. Suppose $\mathcal{M}$, $\mathcal{M}^*$, and $\mathcal{N}$ are models of PA such that:

$$\mathcal{M} \trianglerighteq_{\text{par}} \mathcal{N} \trianglerighteq_{\text{par}} \mathcal{M}^*, \text{ and}$$

there is an $\mathcal{M}$-definable isomorphism $i_0 : \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{M}^*$. A key property[6] of PA is that if $\mathcal{M}$ is a model of PA and $\mathcal{N}$ is a model of the fragment of PA known as (Robinson's) Q, then as soon as $\mathcal{N} \trianglelefteq_{\text{par}} \mathcal{M}$ there is an $\mathcal{M}$-definable initial embedding $j : \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{N}$, i.e., an embedding j such that the image $j(\mathcal{M})$ of $\mathcal{M}$ is (1) a submodel of $\mathcal{N}$, and (2) an initial segment of $\mathcal{N}$. Hence there is an $\mathcal{M}$-definable initial embedding $j_0 : \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{N}$ and an $\mathcal{N}$-definable initial embedding $j_1 : \mathcal{N} \to \mathcal{M}^*$.

We claim that both j_0 and j_1 are surjective. To see this, suppose not. Then $j(M)$ is a proper initial segment of $\mathcal{M}^*$, where j is the $\mathcal{M}$-definable embedding $j : \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{M}^*$ given by $j := j_1 \circ j_0$. But then $i_0^{-1}(j(M))$ is a proper $\mathcal{M}$-definable initial segment of $\mathcal{M}$ with no last element. This is a contradiction since $\mathcal{M}$ is a model of PA, and therefore no proper initial segment of $\mathcal{M}$ is $\mathcal{M}$-definable. Hence j_0 and j_1 are both surjective; in particular j_0 serves as the desired $\mathcal{M}$-definable isomorphism between $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{N}$. □

2.2.1. Corollary. $\mathsf{ZF_{fin}} + \mathsf{TC}$ *is solid.*

Proof. In light of Remark 2.1.1, this is an immediate consequence of coupling Theorem 2.2 and Theorem 1.5. □

Before presenting the proof of solidity of Z_2 we need to state two propositions concerning theories that prove the full scheme of induction over some specified choice of 'numbers'. The proofs of Propositions is a straightforward

[6]This important property seems to have been first noted by Feferman [F], who used it in his proof of Π_1-conservativity of $\neg\text{Con}(\mathsf{PA})$ over PA.

adaptation of the well-known proof for the special case of PA, so it is only presented in outline form.

2.3. Proposition. *Let T be a theory formulated in a language $\mathcal{L}$ such that T interprets Q via an interpretation whose domain formula for 'numbers' is $\mathbb{N}(x)$. Furthermore assume the following two hypotheses*:

(a) $T \vdash \mathsf{Ind}_{\mathbb{N}}(\mathcal{L})$, *where $\mathsf{Ind}_{\mathbb{N}}(\mathcal{L})$ is the scheme of induction over $\mathbb{N}$ whose instances are universal closures of $\mathcal{L}$-formulae of the form below*:

$$(\theta(0) \wedge \forall x\,(\mathbb{N}(x) \wedge \theta(x) \to \theta(x^+))) \to \forall x\,(\mathbb{N}(x) \to \theta(x))\,,$$

where x^+ is shorthand for the successor of x, and θ is allowed to have suppressed parameters; these parameters are not required to lie in $\mathbb{N}$.

(b) $\mathcal{K} \models T$ *and* $\mathcal{K} \trianglerighteq_{\mathrm{par}} \mathcal{N} \models \mathsf{Q}$.

Then *there is a $\mathcal{K}$-definable initial embedding* $j : \mathbb{N}^{\mathcal{K}} \to \mathcal{N}$.

Proof outline. Since $\mathbb{N}^{\mathcal{K}} \models \mathsf{Q} + \mathsf{Ind}_{\mathbb{N}}(\mathcal{L})$, the following definition by recursion produces the desired j.

$$j(0^{\mathbb{N}^{\mathcal{K}}}) = 0^{\mathcal{N}} \text{ and } j\left((x^+)^{\mathbb{N}^{\mathcal{K}}}\right) = (j(x)^+)^{\mathcal{N}}\,.$$

□

2.4. Proposition. *Suppose $\mathcal{K}$ is an $\mathcal{L}$-structure that interprets a model of Q via an interpretation whose domain formula for 'numbers' is $\mathbb{N}(x)$ and $\mathsf{Ind}_{\mathbb{N}}(\mathcal{L})$ holds in $\mathcal{K}$. Then every $\mathcal{K}$-definable proper initial segment of $\mathbb{N}^{\mathcal{K}}$ has a last element.*

Proof. Easy: the veracity of $\mathsf{Ind}_{\mathbb{N}}(\mathcal{L})$ in $\mathcal{K}$ immediately implies that any $\mathcal{K}$-definable initial segment of $\mathbb{N}^{\mathcal{K}}$ with no last element coincides with $\mathbb{N}^{\mathcal{K}}$.□

2.5. Theorem. Z_2 *is solid.*

Proof. Following standard practice (as in [S]) models of Z_2 are represented as two-sorted structures of the form $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A})$, where $\mathcal{M} \models \mathsf{PA}$, $\mathcal{A}$ is a collection of subsets of M, and $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A})$ satisfies the full comprehension scheme. Suppose $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A})$, $(\mathcal{M}^*, \mathcal{A}^*)$, and $(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{B})$ are models of Z_2 such that:

$$(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A}) \trianglerighteq_{\mathrm{par}} (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{B}) \trianglerighteq_{\mathrm{par}} (\mathcal{M}^*, \mathcal{A}^*)\,,$$

and there is an $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A})$-definable isomorphism

$$\widehat{i_0} : (\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A}) \to (\mathcal{M}^*, \mathcal{A}^*)\,.$$

Note that $\widehat{i_0}$ is naturally induced by i_0, where:

$$i_0 := \widehat{i_0} \restriction M : \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{M}^*,$$

since $\widehat{i_0}(A) = \{i_0(m) : m \in A\}$ for $A \in \mathcal{A}^*$.

It is clear that $\mathsf{Z}_2 \vdash \mathsf{Q}^{\mathbb{N}} + \mathsf{Ind}_{\mathbb{N}}(\mathcal{L})$ for $\mathcal{L} := \mathcal{L}_{\mathsf{Z}_2}$, so by Proposition 2.3, we may conclude:

(1) There is an $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A})$-definable *initial embedding* $j_0 : \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{N}$, and

(2) There is an $(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{B})$-definable *initial embedding* $j_1 : \mathcal{N} \to \mathcal{M}^*$.

Similar to the proof of Theorem 2.2 we now argue that both j_0 and j_1 are surjective since otherwise the $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A})$-definable embedding $j : \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{M}^*$ given by $j := j_1 \circ j_0$ will have the property that $j(M)$ is a proper initial segment of $\mathcal{M}^*$, which in turn implies that $i_0^{-1}(j(M))$ is an $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A})$-definable proper initial segment of $\mathcal{M}$ with no last element, which contradicts Proposition 2.4. Hence (1) and (2) can be strengthened to:

(1^+) There is an $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A})$-definable *isomorphism* $k_0 : \mathcal{N} \to \mathcal{M}$, and

(2^+) There is an $(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{B})$-definable *isomorphism* $k_1 : \mathcal{M}^* \to \mathcal{N}$.

Let $\widehat{k_0} : (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{B}) \to (\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A})$ be the natural extension of k_0, i.e., $\widehat{k_0}(n) := k_0(n)$ for $n \in N$, and $\widehat{k_0}(B) = \{k_0(n) : n \in B\}$ for $B \in \mathcal{B}$. Note that the $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A})$-definability of k_0, along with the veracity of the comprehension scheme in $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A})$ assures us that $\widehat{k_0}(B) \in \mathcal{A}$ for each $B \in \mathcal{B}$. Therefore $\widehat{k_0}$ is an *embedding.* Using an identical reasoning, since $(\mathcal{M}^*, \mathcal{A}^*)$ is $(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{B})$-definable by assumption, we can extend k_1 to an embedding $\widehat{k_1} : (\mathcal{M}^*, \mathcal{A}^*) \to (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{B})$. Let $\widehat{k} := \widehat{k_0} \circ \widehat{k_1} \circ \widehat{i_0}$. Then:

(3) $\widehat{k} : (\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A}) \to (\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A})$ and $\widehat{k}$ is an $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A})$-definable embedding.

The proof of Theorem 2.5 will be complete once we verify that $\widehat{k_0}$ is surjective. Since we already know that k_0 is surjective, it suffices to check that $\mathcal{A} = \widehat{k_0}(\mathcal{B}) := \{\widehat{k_0}(B) : B \in \mathcal{B}\}$. Observe that the restriction $k : \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{M}$ of $\widehat{i}$ to 'numbers' is an automorphism of $\mathcal{M}$, thanks to (1^+), (2^+), and the assumption that $\widehat{i_0}$ is an isomorphism. But since $\widehat{k}$ is $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A})$-definable $i(m) = m$ for all $m \in M$, thanks to the veracity of $\mathsf{Ind}_{\mathbb{N}}(\mathcal{L})$ in $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A})$, for $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{\mathsf{Z}_2}$, which in turn implies that $\widehat{k}$ is just the identity automorphism on $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A})$. Hence $\widehat{k_0}$ and $\widehat{k_1}$ are both surjective. □

In the following corollary, $\widetilde{\mathsf{ZF}}$ is the result of substituting the Replacement scheme in the usual axiomatization of ZF (e.g., as in [K]) with the scheme of Collection, whose instances consist of universal generalizations

of formulae of the form $(\forall x \in a\ \exists y\ \varphi(x,y)) \rightarrow (\exists b\ \forall x \in a\ \exists y \in b\ \varphi(x,y))$, where the parameters of φ are suppressed.

2.5.1. Corollary. *The following theory T is solid*:

$$T := \widetilde{\mathsf{ZF}}\backslash\{\mathsf{Power\ Set}\} + \forall x\ \ |x| \leq \aleph_0.$$

Proof. In light of Remark 2.1.1, this is an immediate consequence of Theorem 2.5 and the well-known bi-interpretability of T with $\mathsf{Z}_2 + \Pi^1_\infty$-$\mathsf{AC}$, where Π^1_∞-AC is the scheme of choice.[7] □

2.6. Theorem. ZF *is solid.*

Proof. Suppose $\mathcal{M}$, $\mathcal{M}^*$, and $\mathcal{N}$ are models of ZF such that:

$$\mathcal{M} \trianglerighteq_{\mathrm{par}} \mathcal{N} \trianglerighteq_{\mathrm{par}} \mathcal{M}^*,$$

and there is an $\mathcal{M}$-definable isomorphism $i_0 : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}^*$. Since $\mathcal{M}$ injects M into M^* via i_0, and $M^* \subseteq N$, we have:

(1) N is a proper class as viewed from $\mathcal{M}$.

Let $E := \in^{\mathcal{M}^*}$. E is both extensional and well-founded as viewed from $\mathcal{N}$; extensionality trivially follows from the assumption that $\mathcal{M}^* \models \mathsf{ZF}$, and well-foundedness can be easily verified using the assumptions that $\mathcal{M} \trianglerighteq_{\mathrm{par}} \mathcal{N}$ and i_0 is an $\mathcal{M}$-definable isomorphism between $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{M}^*$. We wish to show that $E := \in^{\mathcal{M}^*}$ is *set-like*[8] as viewed from $\mathcal{N}$, i.e., for every $c \in M^*$, c_E is a set (as opposed to a proper class) of $\mathcal{N}$, where $c_E := \{x \in M^* : xEc\}$. This will take some effort to establish. We will present the argument in full detail, especially because a natural adaptation of the same argument will also work in one of the stages of the proof of Theorem 2.7 (establishing the solidity of KM), and will therefore be left to the reader. We will first show that E is set-like when restricted to $\mathbf{Ord}^{\mathcal{M}^*}$.[9] To this end, let $\delta \in \mathbf{Ord}^{\mathcal{M}^*}$, $\delta_E := \{m \in M^* : mE\delta\}$, and consider the $\mathcal{N}$-definable ordered structure Δ:

$$\Delta := \big(\delta_E, E \cap \delta_E^2\big).$$

[7] This bi-interpretability was first explicitly noted by Mostowski in the context of the so-called β-models of $\mathsf{Z}_2 + \Pi^1_\infty$-$\mathsf{AC}$ (which correspond to well-founded models of T). See [S, Theorem VII.3.34] for a refined version of this bi-interpretability result.

[8] In the context of ZF, the extension of a binary formula $R(x,y)$ is set-like iff for every set s there is a set t such that $t = \{x : R(x,s)\}$.

[9] Note that if the axiom of choice holds in $\mathcal{M}^*$, then by Zermelo's well-ordering theorem, from the point of view of $\mathcal{N}$ the set-likeness of E when restricted to $\mathbf{Ord}^{\mathcal{M}^*}$ immediately implies the set-likeness of E.

It is clear, thanks to i_0, that $\mathcal{N}$ views Δ as a *well-founded* linear order in the strong sense that every nonempty $\mathcal{N}$-definable subclass of δ_E has an E-least member. In particular, Δ is a linear order in which every element other than the last element (if it exists) has an immediate successor. Given $\gamma \in \mathbf{Ord}^{\mathcal{N}}$ let $o(\Delta) \geq \gamma$ be an abbreviation for the statement:

> "there is some set f such that f is the (graph of) an order preserving function between $(\gamma, \in)$ and an initial segment of Δ",

and let $o(\Delta) \geq \mathbf{Ord}$ abbreviate "$\forall \gamma \in \mathbf{Ord}\ o(\Delta) \geq \gamma$". We wish to show that the statement $o(\Delta) \geq \mathbf{Ord}$ does not hold in $\mathcal{N}$. Suppose it does. Then arguing in $\mathcal{N}$, for each $\gamma \in \mathbf{Ord}$ there is an order-preserving map f_γ which embeds $(\gamma, \in)$ onto an initial segment of Δ. Moreover, such an f_γ is unique since it is a theorem of ZF that no ordinal has a nontrivial automorphism. Hence if $\gamma \in \gamma'$, then $f_\gamma \subseteq f_{\gamma'}$ and therefore $f := \cup\{f_\gamma : \gamma \in \mathbf{Ord}\}$ serves as an order-preserving $\mathcal{N}$-definable injection of $\mathbf{Ord}^{\mathcal{N}}$ onto an initial segment of Δ. Invoking the assumption $\mathcal{M} \trianglerighteq_{\mathrm{par}} \mathcal{N}$ this shows that $\mathcal{M}$ must view $\mathcal{N}$ as well-founded because the map $\rho^{\mathcal{N}} : (N, \in^{\mathcal{N}}) \to (\mathbf{Ord}, \in)^{\mathcal{N}}$ (where ρ is the usual rank function) is $\in^N$-preserving and $\mathcal{N}$-definable, and therefore $\mathcal{M}$-definable since $\mathcal{M} \trianglerighteq_{\mathrm{par}} \mathcal{N}$. This allows us to conclude that:

(2) $\mathcal{M}$ views $(N, \in^{\mathcal{N}})$ as a well-founded extensional structure of ordinal height at most $i_0^{-1}(\delta) \in \mathbf{Ord}^{\mathcal{M}}$.

At this point we wish to invoke an appropriate form of Mostwoski's collapse theorem in order to show that (2) implies that N is a *set* from the point of view of $\mathcal{M}$. To this end, consider KP (Kripke-Platek set theory) whose axioms consist of Extensionality, Empty Set, Pairs, Union, Π_1-Foundation, and Σ_0-Collection[10]. It is well-known that KP is finitely axiomatizable, and that, provably in KP, ρ (the rank function) is an $\in$-homomorphism of the universe onto the class $\mathbf{Ord}$ of ordinals. Let KPR (Kripke-Platek set theory with ranks) be the strengthening of KP with the axiom that states that $\{x : \rho(x) < \alpha\}$ is a set for each $\alpha \in \mathbf{Ord}$. Theorem 2.6.1 below can be either seen as a scheme of theorems of ZF, or a single theorem of Gödel-Bernays theory of classes.

2.6.1. Theorem. *If* KPR *holds in* $\mathcal{N}$, *and* $\mathbf{Ord}^{\mathcal{N}} \cong \alpha \in \mathbf{Ord}$, *then* $\mathcal{N}$ *is isomorphic to a transitive substructure of* $(V_\alpha, \in)$.

[10] It is well-known that Σ_1-Collection is provable in KP, which enables KP to carry out Σ_1-recursions. Also note that the formulation of KP in many references (including Barwise's monograph [B]) that focus on admissible set theroy includes the full scheme of Foundation since admissible sets are transtive and automatically satisfy Π_∞-Foundation. Our forumlation of KP is taken from Mathias' paper [Ma].

Proof outline. Let $h : \alpha \to \mathbf{Ord}^{\mathcal{N}}$ witness the isomorphism of α and $\mathbf{Ord}^{\mathcal{N}}$, and for $\gamma < \alpha$ let $\mathcal{N}_\gamma := (V_{h(\gamma)}, \in)^{\mathcal{N}}$. A routine induction on $\gamma < \alpha$ shows that there is a unique embedding $j_\gamma : \mathcal{N}_\gamma \to (V_\gamma, \in)$ whose range is transitive. This implies that if $\delta < \gamma < \alpha$, then $j_\delta \subseteq j_\gamma$. It is then easy to verify that $j_\alpha : \mathcal{N} \to (V_\alpha, \in)$ is an embedding with a transitive range, where $j_\alpha := \cup \{j_\gamma : \gamma < \alpha\}$. □

By coupling (2) with Theorem 2.6.1 we can conclude that N forms a set in $\mathcal{M}$, thus contradicting (1). This concludes our verification of the failure of $o(\Delta) \geq \mathbf{Ord}$ within $\mathcal{N}$.

The failure of $o(\Delta) \geq \mathbf{Ord}$ in $\mathcal{N}$ allows us to choose $\gamma_0 \in \mathbf{Ord}^{\mathcal{N}}$ such that $\mathcal{N}$ views γ_0 to be the first ordinal γ such that $o(\Delta) \geq \gamma$ is false. We claim that γ_0 is a successor ordinal of $\mathbf{Ord}^{\mathcal{N}}$. If not, then, arguing in $\mathcal{N}$, for each $\beta \in \gamma_0$ there is a unique order-preserving map f_β which maps $(\beta, \in)$ onto an initial segment of Δ, and $f_\beta \subseteq f_{\beta'}$ whenever $\beta \in \beta' \in \gamma_0$, then $f_\beta \subseteq f_{\beta'}$. Therefore $\cup \{f_\gamma : \gamma \in \gamma_0\}$ serves as an order-preserving map between $(\gamma_0, \in)$ and an initial segment of Δ, contradicting the choice of γ_0. Hence $\gamma_0 = \beta_0 + 1$ for some $\beta_0 \in \mathbf{Ord}^{\mathcal{N}}$. This makes it clear that:

(3) f_{β_0} is a bijection between β_0 and δ_E,

since if the range of f_{β_0} is not all of δ_E, then the range $\mathrm{ran}(f_{\beta_0})$ of f_{β_0} is a proper initial segment of Δ, and f_{β_0} could be extended to an order-preserving map f_{γ_0} with domain γ_0 by setting:

$$f_{\gamma_0}(\beta_0) = \min(\delta_E \backslash \mathrm{ran}(f_{\beta_0})).$$

Thanks to (3), we now know that, as viewed by $\mathcal{N}$, E is set-like when restricted to $\mathbf{Ord}^{\mathcal{M}^*}$. To verify the set-likeness of E in $\mathcal{N}$ it is sufficient to show that s_E forms a set in $\mathcal{N}$, where $s_E := \{m \in M^* : mEs\}$ and $s := V_\delta^{\mathcal{M}^*}$ for some $\delta \in \mathbf{Ord}^{\mathcal{M}^*}$ such that KPR holds in $V_\delta^{\mathcal{M}^*}$, since such ordinals δ are cofinal in $\mathbf{Ord}^{\mathcal{M}^*}$ by the Reflection Theorem of ZF. Consider the $\mathcal{N}$-definable structure Σ :

$$\Sigma := \left(s_E, E \cap s_E^2\right).$$

Since Σ is a model of KPR whose set of ordinals is isomorphic to β_0, by Theorem 2.6.1 (applied within $\mathcal{N}$) there is an $\mathcal{N}$-definable embedding of Σ onto a (transitive) subset of $V_{\beta_0}^{\mathcal{N}}$. This makes it evident that s_E forms a set in $\mathcal{N}$. Combined with (2) this allows us to conclude:

(4) E is extensional, set-like, and well-founded within $\mathcal{N}$.

At this point we invoke the Class-form of Mostowski's Collapse Theorem:

2.6.2. Theorem. [K, Theorem 5.14] *Suppose E is a well-founded, set-like class, and extensional on a class M^*; then there is a transitive class S and a 1-1 map G from M^* onto S such that G is an isomorphism between (M^*, E) and $(S, \in)$.*

Theorem 2.6.2 together with (4) assure us of the existence of an $\mathcal{N}$-definable $S \subseteq N$ such that S is transitive from the point of view of $\mathcal{N}$, and which has the property that there is an $\mathcal{N}$-definable isomorphism i_1, where

$$i_1 : \mathcal{M}^* \to (S, \in)^{\mathcal{N}}.$$

Finally, we verify that $S = N$. We first note that S must be a proper class in the sense of $\mathcal{N}$, since otherwise $\mathcal{N}$ would be able to define the satisfaction predicate for $(S, \in)^{\mathcal{N}}$, which coupled with the assumption that $\mathcal{N}$ is interpretable in $\mathcal{M}$, and $i := i_1 \circ i_0$ is an $\mathcal{M}$-definable isomorphism between $\mathcal{M}$ and $(S, \in)^{\mathcal{N}}$, would result in $\mathcal{M}$ being able to define a satisfaction predicate for itself, which contradicts (an appropriate version of) *Tarski's Undefinability of Truth Theorem*[11].The transitivity of S coupled with the fact that S is a proper class in $\mathcal{N}$ together imply that S contains all of the ordinals of $\mathcal{N}$. Therefore, if $S \neq N$, then arguing in $\mathcal{N}$, let V_α^S be V_α in the sense of $(S, \in)$ and let

$$\alpha_0 = \text{the first ordinal } \alpha \text{ such that } V_\alpha = V_\alpha^S, \text{ but } V_{\alpha+1} \backslash V_{\alpha+1}^S \neq \varnothing.$$

This makes it clear, in light of the assumption that $\mathcal{M} \trianglerighteq_{\text{par}} \mathcal{N}$, and the fact that i is an isomorphism between $\mathcal{M}$ and $(S, \in)^{\mathcal{N}}$, that we have a contradiction at hand since $\mathcal{M}$ believes that $\mathcal{N}$ sees a 'new subset' of $V_{i^{-1}(\alpha_0)}$ of $\mathcal{M}$ that is missing from $\mathcal{M}$. Hence $S = N$ and we may conclude that i is an $\mathcal{M}$-definable isomorphism between $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{N}$. □

2.7. Theorem. KM *is solid.*

Proof. Models of KM can be represented as two-sorted structures of the form $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A})$, where $\mathcal{M} \models \mathsf{ZF}$; $\mathcal{A}$ is a collection of subsets of M; and $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A})$ satisfies the full comprehension scheme. Suppose $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A})$, $(\mathcal{M}^*, \mathcal{A}^*)$, and $(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{B})$ are models of KM such that:

[11] For a structure $\mathcal{M}$ let:

$\mathrm{Th}^+(\mathcal{M}) = \{(\ulcorner \sigma \urcorner, a) : \mathcal{M} \models \sigma(a)\}$, and $\mathrm{Th}^-(\mathcal{M}) = \{(\ulcorner \sigma \urcorner, a) : \mathcal{M} \models \neg\sigma(a)\}$.

With the above notation in mind, the version of Tarski's theorem that is invoked here says that if $\mathcal{M}$ is a structure that interprets Q and is endowed with a pairing function, then $\mathrm{Th}^+(\mathcal{M})$ and $\mathrm{Th}^-(\mathcal{M})$ are $\mathcal{M}$-inseparable, i.e., there is no $\mathcal{M}$-definable D such that $\mathrm{Th}^+(\mathcal{M}) \subseteq D$ and $\mathrm{Th}^-(\mathcal{M}) \cap D = \varnothing$.

$$(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A}) \trianglerighteq_{\text{par}} (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{B}) \trianglerighteq_{\text{par}} (\mathcal{M}^*, \mathcal{A}^*)\,,$$

and there is an $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A})$-definable isomorphism

$$\widehat{i_0} : (\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A}) \to (\mathcal{M}^*, \mathcal{A}^*)\,.$$

As in the proof of Theorem 2.5 we note that $\widehat{i_0}$ is naturally induced by i_0, where:

$$i_0 := \widehat{i_0} \restriction M : \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{M}^*,$$

since $\widehat{i_0}(A) = \{i_0(m) : m \in A\}$ for $A \in \mathcal{A}^*$.

N forms a proper class in $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A})$ since if N forms a set, then so does $\mathcal{B}$, and $\widehat{i_0}$ is an $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A})$-definable bijection between $M \cup \mathcal{A}$ and a subset of $N \cup \mathcal{B}$. Let $E := \in^{\mathcal{M}^*}$. Clearly E is extensional. Furthermore, with the help of i_0 and the assumption $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A}) \trianglerighteq_{\text{par}} (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{B})$ it is easy to see that E is well-founded from the point of view of $(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{B})$. The reader is asked to verify that an argument very similar to the one used in the proof of Theorem 2.6 shows that E is also set-like in the sense of $(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{B})$. Theorem 2.6.2 can then be invoked to obtain an $(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{B})$-definable isomorphism

$$k_1 : \mathcal{M}^* \to (S, \in^N)$$

for some $(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{B})$-definable transitive $S \subseteq N$. The verification that $S = N$ is identical to the corresponding part in the proof of Theorem 2.6 (and in particular uses Tarski's undefinability of truth theorem). Let $k_0 := i_0^{-1} \circ k_1^{-1}$. Clearly:

(5) $k_0 : \mathcal{N} \to \mathcal{M}$ is an $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A})$-definable isomorphism, and

(6) $k_1 : \mathcal{M}^* \to \mathcal{N}$ is an $(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{B})$-definable isomorphism.

Borrowing a notation from the proof of Theorem 2.5, let $\widehat{k_0} : (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{B}) \to (\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A})$ be the natural extension of k_0, and $\widehat{k_1} : (\mathcal{M}^*, \mathcal{A}^*) \to (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{B})$ be the natural extension of k_1. Note that both $\widehat{k_0}$ and $\widehat{k_1}$ are *embeddings.* Let $\widehat{k} := \widehat{k_0} \circ \widehat{k_1} \circ \widehat{i_0}$; it is clear that:

(7) $\widehat{k} : (\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A}) \to (\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A})$ and $\widehat{k}$ is an $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A})$-definable embedding.

Observe that (5) and (6), together with the assumption that i_0 is an isomorphism imply that the restriction $k : \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{M}$ of $\widehat{k}$ to 'sets' is an automorphism of $\mathcal{M}$. But since $\widehat{k}$ is $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A})$-definable, $k(m) = m$ for all $m \in M$,

thanks to the veracity of the scheme of $\in$-induction[12] in KM. This shows that $\widehat{k}$ is the identity map and in particular it is surjective, which in turn implies that $\widehat{k_0}$ and $\widehat{k_1}$ are both surjective. This makes it clear that there is an $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A})$-definable isomorphism between $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A})$ and $(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{B})$. $\square$

Recall that $\widetilde{\mathsf{ZF}}$ was defined earlier, just before Corollary 2.5.1.

2.7.1. Corollary. *The following theory T is solid*:

$$T := \widetilde{\mathsf{ZF}} \backslash \{\mathsf{Power\ Set}\} + \text{“}\exists \kappa\ (\kappa \textit{ is strongly inaccessible, and } \forall x\ |x| \leq \kappa\text{”}).$$

Proof. In light of Remark 2.1.1, this follows from Theorem 2.8 and the well-known bi-interpretability of T with $\mathsf{KM} + \Pi^1_\infty$-$\mathsf{AC}$, where Π^1_∞-AC is the scheme of Choice.[13] $\square$

2.8. Remark. An examination of the proofs in this section make it clear that for each positive integer n, the theories Z_n (n-th order arithmetic) and KM_n (n-th order Kelley-Morse theory of classes) are solid theories (where $\mathsf{Z}_1 := \mathsf{PA}$, and $\mathsf{KM}_1 := \mathsf{ZF}$). This observation, in turn, implies that the theory of types Z_ω (with full comprehension) whose level-zero objects form a model of PA (equivalently $\mathsf{ZF_{fin}} + \mathsf{TC}$), and the theory of types KM_ω whose level-zero objects form a model of ZF are also solid theories. Thus, the list of theories whose solidity is established in this section can be described (up to bi-interpretability) as $\{\mathsf{Z}_n : 1 \leq n \leq \omega\} \cup \{\mathsf{KM}_n : 1 \leq n \leq \omega\}$.

3 Examples and Questions

All of the theories T whose solidity was established in Section 2 are sequential[14] theories which have an interpretation $\mathbb{N}$ for ‘numbers’ for which the full scheme $\mathsf{Ind}_{\mathbb{N}}(\mathcal{L}_T)$ of induction is T-provable, so one may ask whether the

[12] The scheme of $\in$-induction consists of the universal closures of formulas of the form $\forall y\,(\forall x{\in}y\ \theta\,(x) \to \theta(y)) \to \forall z\,\theta(z)$, where the parameters in θ are suppressed. It is easy to see that the scheme of $\in$-induction is equivalent to the class-form of Foundation, which asserts that every nonempty definable collection of sets has an $\in$-minimal element. The class-form of Foundation follows from the set-form of Foundation and the comprehension scheme of KM: suppose a class C is nonempty, and let α_0 be the first ordinal α such that $V_\alpha \cap C \neq \varnothing$. Then an $\in$-minimal member of $V_{\alpha_0} \cap C$ is also an $\in$-minimal member of C.

[13] This bi-interpretability was first noted by Mostowski; a modern account is given in a recent paper of Antos & Friedman [AF, section 2], where $\mathsf{KM} + \Pi^1_\infty$-$\mathsf{AC}$ is referred to as MK^*, and T is referred to as SetMK^*.

[14] A sequential theory is a theory that has access to a definable ‘β-function’ for coding finite sequences of objects in the domain of discourse.

T-provability of $\mathsf{Ind}_{\mathbb{N}}(\mathcal{L}_T)$ within a sequential theory is a sufficient condition for solidity. A simple counterexample gives a negative answer: let $\mathsf{PA}(\mathsf{G})$ be the natural extension of PA in which the induction scheme is extended to formulae in the language obtained by adding a unary predicate G to the language of arithmetic. To see that $\mathsf{PA}(\mathsf{G})$ is not solid, consider the extensions T_1 and T_2 of $\mathsf{PA}(\mathsf{G})$, where:

$$T_1 := \mathsf{PA}(\mathsf{G}) + \forall x(\mathsf{G}(x) \leftrightarrow x = 1) \text{ and } T_2 := \mathsf{PA}(\mathsf{G}) + \forall x(\mathsf{G}(x) \leftrightarrow x = 2).$$

Clearly the deductive closures of T_1 and T_2 are distinct, and yet it is easy to see that T_1 and T_2 are bi-interpretable. This shows that $\mathsf{PA}(\mathsf{G})$ is not tight, and therefore not solid.

With the help of [ESV, Theorem 4.9 & Remark 4.10] one can also show that the theory $\mathsf{ZF}_{\mathsf{fin}}$ is not tight, even though as shown in Corollary 2.2.1 its strengthening by TC is a solid theory. Another example of a theory that fails to be tight is $\mathsf{ZF}\backslash\{\mathsf{Foundation}\}$. To see this, consider $T_1 := \mathsf{ZF}$, and

$$T_2 := \mathsf{ZF}\backslash\{\mathsf{Foundation}\} + \exists!x(x = \{x\} + \forall t \exists \alpha(t \in V_\alpha(x)),$$

where α ranges over ordinals, and

$$V_0(x) := x,\ V_{\alpha+1}(x) := \mathcal{P}(V_\alpha(x)), \text{ and } V_\alpha(x) := \bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} V_\beta(x) \text{ for limit } \alpha.$$

Then T_1 and T_2 are extensions of $\mathsf{ZF}\backslash\{\mathsf{Foundation}\}$ with distinct deductive closures, and yet, the bi-interpretability of T_1 and T_2 can be established by well-known methods: the relevant interpretations are $\mathcal{I}$ and $\mathcal{J}$, where $\mathcal{I}$ is the classic von Neumann interpretation of ZF in $\mathsf{ZF}\backslash\{\mathsf{Foundation}\}$, and $\mathcal{J}$ is the classic Rieger-Bernays interpretation that adds a single 'Quine atom' (i.e., a set s such that $s = \{s\}$) to a model of ZF.

However, we do not know whether $T \vdash \mathsf{Q}^{\mathbb{N}} + \mathsf{Ind}_{\mathbb{N}}(\mathcal{L}_T)$ for every solid sequential theory (for an appropriate choice of numbers $\mathbb{N}$). This motivates the following question, since by a general result of Montague [Mo] the T-provability of $\mathsf{Q}^{\mathbb{N}} + \mathsf{Ind}_{\mathbb{N}}(\mathcal{L}_T)$ implies that T is not finitely axiomatizable.

3.1. Question. *Is there a consistent sequential finitely axiomatized theory that is solid?*

The question below arises from reflecting on the results of Section 2 and noting that the proofs of solidity of each of the theories T established in Section 2 uses the 'full power' of T.

3.2. Question. *Is there an example T of one of the theories whose solidity is established in Theorem 1.2, and some* ***solid*** *$T_0 \subseteq T$ such that the deductive closure of T_0 is a proper subset of the deductive closure of T?*

4 Acknowledgements

It is a pleasure and an honor to present this paper in a volume that celebrates Albert Visser's scholarship; I am grateful to Albert for bringing his Theorem 1.1 to my attention. Thanks also to Andrés Caicedo and Radek Honzík, whose interest in the ZF-case of Theorem 1.2 provided additional impetus for writing up the results here; and to the anonymous reviewer for invaluable help in weeding out infelicities of an earlier draft. Hats off to Jan, Joost and Rosalie for their dedication in bringing this volume to fruition.

References

[A] W. Ackermann, *Zur widerspruchsfreiheit der zahlentheorie*, **Math. Ann**. 117 (1940), pp. 162-194.

[AZ] G. Ahlbrandt & M. Ziegler, *Quasi-finitely axiomatizable totally categorical theories*, **Ann. Pure Appl. Logic** 30 (1986), pp. 63-82.

[AF] C. Antos & S.D. Friedman, *Hyperclass Forcing in Morse-Kelley Class Theory*, manuscript available at **Math. ArXiv.** (2015).

[B] J. Barwise, **Admissible Sets and Structures**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1975.

[D] K. L. de Bouvère, *Synonymous Theories*, In **Theory of Models** (edited by J.W. Addison, L. Henkin, and A. Tarski), Proceedings of the 1963 International Symposium at Berkeley, North Holland, Amsterdam, 1965, pp. 402-406, 1965.

[ESV] A. Enayat, J. Schmerl, & A. Visser, *ω-models of finite set theory*, in **Set Theory, Arithmetic, and Foundations of Mathematics: Theorems, Philosophies** (edited by J. Kennedy and R. Kossak), Cambridge University Press, 2011, pp. 43-65.

[F] S. Feferman, *Arithmetization of metamathematics in a general setting*, **Fund. Math.** 49 (1960), pp. 35-92.

[FV] H.M. Friedman & A. Visser, *When bi-interpretability implies synonymy*, available through Utrecht Preprint series (2014).

[H] W. Hodges, **Model theory**, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993.

[KW] R. Kaye & T. L. Wong, *On interpretations of arithmetic and set theory*, **Notre Dame J. Formal Logic**, 48 (2007), pp. 497-510.

[Ma] A.R.D. Mathias, T*he strength of Mac Lane set theory*, **Ann. Pure Appl. Logic** 110 (2001), pp. 107–234.

[Mo] R. Montague, *Semantical closure and non-finite axiomatizability. I*, in **Infinitistic Methods** (Proc. Sympos. Foundations of Math., Warsaw, 1959). Pergamon, Oxford; Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, Warsaw, 1961, pp. 45-69.

[My] J. Mycielski, *The definition of arithmetic operations in the Ackermann model* (Russian), **Algebra i Logika Sem.** 3 no. 5-6 (1964), pp. 64–65.

[K] K. Kunen, **Set theory**, North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1983.

[S] S. Simpson, **Subsystems of Second Order Arithmetic**, Springer, Heidelberg 1999.

[V] A. Visser, *Categories of theories and interpretations,* **Logic in Tehran**, Lecture Notes in Logic, vol. 26, Association for Symbolic Logic, La Jolla, CA, 2006, pp. 284–341.